REMARKS

In view of the above amendments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 4-11, 13-16 and 18-20 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 15 are independent.

Amendments have been made to claims 1, 4-6, 11, 13-15 and 18-20, and claims 2, 3, 12 and 17 have been canceled. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document. Acknowledgment thereof by the Examiner in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 11, 2009, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy PTO-SB08 form filed therewith.

Drawings

Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-10, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP '082 or CH '602. Claims 1-10, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '082, CH '602 or Lee, in view of Jeon. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Application No. 10/591,437 Docket No.: 3449-0655PUS1
Amendment dated December 3, 2009 Page 8
Reply to Office Action of Sentember 3, 2009

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

With regard to the rejection of claims 11-14, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 11 has been amended to include the limitations of objected-to allowable claim 12, thereby automatically placing independent claim 11 into condition for allowance, along with dependent claims 13 and 14.

With regard to the rejection of claims 15-20, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of objected-to allowable claim 17, thereby automatically placing independent claim 15 into condition for allowance, along with dependent claims 16 and 18-20.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a washing machine including a control panel for selecting a wash cycle, a sensor for sensing a load of laundry inside a drum during an operation of the wash cycle selected through the control panel, and a control unit for conducting the wash cycle selected through the control panel and controlling an rpm speed of the drum according to the sensed load of laundry sensed by the sensor, for untangling the laundry, wherein the sensor senses the load of laundry inside the drum and the control unit establishes ranges when the load of laundry is sensed by the sensor to be under the specific load, and the control unit controls the accelerating rate of rpm speed of the drum in different accelerating rates. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including JP '082 and CH '602.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form to recite a combination of elements in a washing machine including a control panel for selecting a wash cycle, a sensor for sensing a load of laundry inside a drum during an operation of the wash cycle selected through the control panel, and a control unit for conducting the wash

cycle selected through the control panel and controlling an rpm speed of the drum according to the sensed load of laundry sensed by the sensor, for untangling the laundry, wherein the control unit controls a spin cycle according to whether the load of laundry sensed by the sensor is a single article, when the rinse cycle is begun. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 6 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including JP '082 and CH '602.

Additionally, Applicants note that claim 6 has only been re-written in independent form without any amendments to raise new issues, and therefore any new rejection of claim 6 cannot properly be made final.

JP '082 discloses a detector 13 for sensing a load of laundry, and a control device 14 which sets several steps of untangling the laundry according to the detected load of laundry detected by the detector 13. JP '082 discloses that untangling of the laundry is conducted during the wash cycle.

CH '602 discloses a force sensor 8 for sensing the weight of laundry, and instability.

Lee discloses measuring a load weight (S201), and increasing a speed at optimal acceleration rate based on the measured load weight (S202).

However, JP '082, CH '602 and Lee fail to disclose that the sensor senses the load of laundry inside the drum and the control unit establishes ranges when the load of laundry is sensed by the sensor to be under the specific load, and the control unit controls the accelerating rate of the rpm speed of the drum in different accelerating rates, as set forth in independent claim 1, as amended.

JP '082, CH '602 and Lee also fail to disclose that the control unit controls a spin cycle according to whether the load of laundry sensed by the sensor is a single article, when the rinse cycle is begun as set forth in independent claim 6.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 and 6 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including JP '082, CH '602, Lee and Jeon, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Docket No.: 3449-0655PUS1 Page 10

With regard to dependent claims 4, 5 and 7-10, Applicants submit that claims 4, 5 and 7-10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 or 6 which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 4, 5 and 7-10 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1 or 6. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 12-14 and 17-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. As set forth above, the limitations of objected-to claim 12 have been added into independent claim 11, and therefore independent claim 11 should be in condition for allowance. Also, claims 13 and 14 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 11, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claim 11 which is believed to be allowable.

In addition, as set forth above, the limitations of objected-to claim 17 have been added into independent claim 15, and therefore independent claim 15 should be in condition for allowance. Also, claims 16 and 18-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 15, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claim 15 which is believed to be allowable.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/591,437 Amendment dated December 3, 2009 Reply to Office Action of September 3, 2009

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone James T. Eller, Jr., Registration No. 39.538, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 3, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Docket No.: 3449-0655PUS1

Page 11

8110 Gatehouse Road Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000 Attorney for Applicant